

Abraham Terian

KORIWN'S *LIFE OF MASHTOTS'* AS AN ENCOMIUM

Most of the literary output of the Golden Age, which began with the completion of the Armenian alphabet by Mashtots' in A.D. 406, consists of biblical and patristic translations produced by his school of translators. There are but few works composed in Armenian by these early scholars. Mashtots' himself is credited with writing "numerous easily understood and gracious sermons" (Koriwn, 78.3-5) and "many hortatory and cautionary epistles" (92.1), and some liturgical works are attributed to his associate and patron, the Catholicos Sahak (cf. 74.13).¹ Of their immediate disciples, Eznik wrote *A Refutation of the Sects*, and Koriwn, *The Life of Mashtots'*. Koriwn's tribute to his beloved master is the best known of these earliest writings in Armenian. Its literary form, however, has not been studied sufficiently, whereas much attention has been focused on its biographical and historical contents.²

FURTHER INTRODUCTION AND INQUIRY

The "honorable" Hovsēp', an early disciple of Mashtots' and then locum tenens of the Catholicosate, had commissioned Koriwn to write *The Life of Mashtots'* (22.14-15). Considering it a great privilege, Koriwn declares himself "the least" of the disciples to be given such an honor (22.18).³ Upon further encouragement by fellow disciples he embarks on his task, which, though not lengthy, proves to be a magnum opus. It consists of some forty average pages in manuscript form. There is, however, a shorter version of the *Life* dating from the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century.⁴ It omits significant parts including the lengthy proem, a very important segment of the document and crucial for the subject of this study, and at the same time shows conflation of later sources in its supplementary information.⁵ Scholars

AUTHOR'S NOTE: A shortened form of this essay was delivered in Armenian at the International Conference on Armenian Medieval Literature sessions in Erevan on September 16, 1986.

have rightly preferred the longer version, which survives in a few late manuscripts, the earliest of which date from the fourteenth century.⁶ Of the six editions of the longer text, the first critical edition by M. Abeghian is generally preferred.⁷

As the title of the work suggests, the *Life* abounds with biographical information. It is the primary source on the history of the events surrounding the beginnings of Armenian literary activity and of those responsible for that enlightenment. Enough is said about Mashtots' biographically: his birth, education, service at the royal court, excellence in secular law and the military art, priestly devotion, vigils, evangelistic efforts, gathering of disciples, travels in the quest for letters, translational activities, and his eventual death and burial. The biographical information is often punctuated with hagiographical overtones, and this is to be expected in writings on saints.⁸ The miraculous is commonplace, and the work concludes with heightened religious sentiments. For Koriwn, however, Mashtots' is more than a saint: he is ranked with the perfect, the prophets and the apostles (24.6-34.24; cf. 52.1-8; 90.2-11).⁹

Affinities between Koriwn's literary style and the rhetorical tradition have been observed by K.A. Melik-Ohandjanian in the first part of a short, tripartite study on the *Life*.¹⁰ He notes that the structure of the treatise follows the six principles for encomium outlined in the *Girk' pitoyits'*, a Greek rhetorical textbook identified in part with the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius (late 4th cent. A.D.),¹¹ translated into Armenian late in the sixth century by the so-called Hellenizing School and once wrongly attributed to Movsēs Khorenats'i. But the no longer extant Greek version of the *Girk' pitoyits'* seems to be too late to have been utilized by Koriwn, since its latest source is the fifth-century *Progymnasmata* of Nicolaus.¹² The present study, however, is to show that the structure of Koriwn's *Life* is neither limited to any of the outlines for encomium in the rhetorical textbooks nor dependent on these near-contemporary *progymnasmata*,¹³ but that his work reflects broad familiarity with theoretical texts and literary models. Moreover, a definitive treatment of the literary genre of the *Life* is needed for its classification as an encomium. The lengthy and well-defined proem, which contains the author's declared intention and several other elements recurring in classical proems, is decisive for determining the genre of the work on the basis of internal evidence. I discuss these elements and others in the remaining parts of the treatise after a short survey of the genre and its recurring features—at least those discernible in the *Life*.

ENCOMIUM TRADITIONS IN CLASSICAL LITERATURE

There are several studies that treat the encomium genre as a whole,¹⁴ beginning with its early development within Greek poetic traditions of the sixth century B.C.: the odes to cities and countries, their gods, heroes, distinguished citizens, and popular events. The development of encomiastic prose is attributed to Gorgias of Leontini (ca. 483-376 B.C.) and his famous pupil, Isocrates (436-338 B.C.).¹⁵ Their prose encomia were responsible for establishing an early pattern by highlighting only the noble and by citing deeds as evidence of virtue. The speech of Pericles recorded by Thucydides (ca. 460/455-ca. 400 B.C.) and the *Agesialus* of Xenophon (ca. 428/7-ca. 354 B.C.) became equally important models, reflected in later historians like Dio Chrysostom (ca. A.D. 40-112) and Tacitus (ca. A.D. 56-115), especially in his *Agricola*. Voluminous authors like Plutarch (ca. A.D. 50-120) and Lucian of Samosata (ca. A.D. 120-190) wrote several encomia.¹⁶ The widespread popularity of prose encomia is further attested among Latin authors like Cicero (106-43 B.C.).¹⁷

Isocrates seems to have been equally responsible for setting yet another trend: that of producing handbooks of rhetoric with instructions for composing encomium, treated under epideictic oratory. Although his handbook is no longer extant,¹⁸ it probably influenced the well-known *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, once attributed to Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) and now to his contemporary Anaximenes of Lampsacus (ca. 380-320 B.C.).¹⁹ Two sections of this early manual of rhetoric deal with encomium.²⁰ Of Aristotle's own works, the *Rhetoric*, deemed "the greatest of all oratorical theories,"²¹ contains a section on encomium,²² as do also the later theoretical handbooks²³ and the more popular *progymnasmata*, the practical textbooks which provide preliminary instruction in rhetoric and exercises in composition.²⁴

A review of the three Aristotelian divisions of rhetoric,²⁵ with some elaboration on the third and its subdivisions, is essential for a better understanding of the genre under consideration. Aristotle, whose theories of rhetoric were perhaps anticipated by Anaximenes²⁶ and were generally followed by later theoreticians,²⁷ divided rhetoric into three categories determined by three kinds of listeners to speeches. (1) The judicial or the forensic (Gk. *dikanikon*; Arm. *atenakan*), of concern to judges and jurors, is to accuse or defend someone for an act in the past. (2) The political or the deliberative (Gk. *symboleutikon*; Arm. *khohrdakan*), of concern to politicians, is to urge someone to act or not to act—depending on the expediency of schemes for the future. (3) The epideictic or the demonstrative (Gk. *epideiktikon*; Arm.

ts'uts'akan), of concern to spectators, is to praise or blame someone in the present.

The subdivisions of the third category are characteristic of its intended use: praise (Gk. *egkōmion* or *epainos*; Arm. *nerboghakan* or *govasanakan*) by dwelling on the virtues, and blame (Gk. *psogos*; Arm. *parsawakan*) by dwelling on the vices. Epideictic is not merely "the ceremonial oratory of display," as Aristotle calls it; it has a pragmatic dimension, for by praising the virtuous "we shall be able to inspire confidence in ourselves or others in regard to virtue."²⁸ The two terms for praise and that for epideictic (Gk. *egkōmion*, *epainos*, and *epideiktikon*) appear interchangeably in rhetorical literature, with each of these terms extended to denote the whole exercise. The third division thus becomes synonymous with its predominant subdivision.²⁹ Such terminological fluidity and structural flexibility underscores Aristotle's preference of intent over content. He offers no formal structure in his treatment of epideictic. While the importance of intent is primary and that of content secondary, the significance of the latter need not be minimized; content is governed by intent. Hence Aristotle goes on to propose certain considerations for composing encomia. They may be summarized as follows: (1) to cite the noble or the virtuous: justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, and wisdom—especially deeds that best exemplify these and are esteemed by the audience; and (2) to magnify these deeds especially by amplification and comparison, for "where we take our hero's actions as admitted facts, our business is simply to invest these with dignity and nobility."³⁰ It appears that encomiastic classification on the basis of uniformity in contextual features would constitute a marked departure from the Aristotelian standpoint that recognizes no fixed structures within the genre.

The concern for structure is sharply pronounced by Anaximenes, whose second division of rhetoric is devoted especially to encomium.³¹ He specifies three points to be made in the encomiastic proem: stating the proposition, refuting misrepresentations, and inviting attention by noting the most remarkable deeds of the subject.³² He then outlines the rest as follows: advantages external to virtue, that is, noble descent, physical strength, charm, and wealth; and those inherent in virtue, namely, the cardinal virtues, that is, wisdom, justice, courage and commendable life-style.³³ Then should follow the subject's birth, youth, early manhood, and adulthood, using the cardinal virtues as the organizing principles for the latter.³⁴ The use of comparison, enthymeme, maxim, and other literary constructs like amplification and recapitulation is often recommended for concluding sections.

The traditional Ciceronian elaborations on these principles contain further instructions for composing the various parts. The directions for the introduction (*principium*) account not only for the treatment of the person being praised or the subject under consideration but also for the inclusion of the economiast and the audience.³⁵ Instructions for the narration or statement of facts (*narratio*) repeat the advantages noted above, dividing them into three categories: external circumstances (descent and education), physical attributes (charm, beauty, strength, agility, and good health), and character traits (exhibited in wealth or poverty, power, fame, friendship or enmity, loyalty, benevolence, and good will) demonstrable in the pursuit of the four cardinal virtues.³⁶ Hence it is necessary to recite actions illustrative of the virtues praised; "but the most welcome praise is that bestowed on deeds that appear to have been performed by brave men without profit or reward," especially if they involve toil and danger and are profitable to others. "And one must select achievements that are of outstanding importance or unprecedented or unparalleled in their actual character."³⁷ Moreover, comparison is highly commended: "A splendid line to take in a panegyric is to compare the subject with all other men of high distinction."³⁸ Cicero, however, insists that no formal argumentation is needed within the tripartite scheme of advantages when treating matters that are certain; none the less, the encomiast should adopt a suitable style and be mindful of neologisms, archaisms, metaphors, parallelism, similes, antitheses, doublets, and rhythmic periods.³⁹ The use of embellishment is urged, including "surprising or unexpected events or things foreshadowed by portents and prodigies and by miracles, or what will appear to be occurrences sent by heaven or by fate to the person of whom we shall be speaking."⁴⁰ Achievements could be treated either chronologically, whether the earliest or the most recent first, or topically, under the virtues.⁴¹ In the *Partitiones Oratoriae* Cicero goes on to discuss at length the treatment of virtuous acts, summing up his discussion as follows:

In the whole fabric of the speech the greatest attention is to be focused on the quality of a person's breeding and upbringing and education and character; and on any important or startling occurrence that a man has encountered, especially if this can appear to be due to the intervention of providence; and then each individual's opinions and utterances and actions will be classified under the scheme of the virtues that has been propounded, and these same topics of research will be drawn on to supply the causes and results and consequences of things.⁴²

Finally, there should be a summary (*enumeratio*) and brief amplifications now and then.⁴³

Most of these features appear also in later Greek writers, especially Menander (3d cent. A.D.). A considerable amount of traditional material

is transmitted in the two treatises *Peri epideiktikōn* that pass under his name. The same traditional concerns for composing encomium recur in the rhetorical textbooks, the *progymnasmata*. These concerns, in addition to the preliminary and concluding statements, may be summed up as follows: origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue.⁴⁴ Typical of the *progymnasmata* is the following passage from Aphthonius, cited by Melik-Ohandjian as the ultimate source containing the canons for encomium to which Koriwn adheres in his composition of the *Life*.⁴⁵ It is given here in its entirety both for its summation and in anticipation of the ensuing discussion:

You will make the exordium according to the subject at hand; next, you will place genus, which you will divide into race, fatherland, forebears, and fathers; then, you will take up education, which you will divide into inclination to study, talent, and rules; then, you will bring out the most important topic of the encomium, the achievements, which you will divide into the spirit, the body, and fortune—the spirit like courage or prudence, the body like beauty, swiftness or strength, and fortune like power, wealth, and friends. To these you will add comparison, in order to infer a greater position for the one being praised through the process of placing side by side; finally, the epilogue more in the style of a solemn prayer.⁴⁶

ENCOMIUM TRADITIONS IN KORIWN

Classical rhetoric, including literary models, theoretical manuals, and practical textbooks, had considerable influence on later literature. D. A. Russell's general observation that "the exercises done in schools of rhetoric . . . had a more powerful influence on literature than any amount of theory"⁴⁷ is quite convincing.

Koriwn's familiarity with the early *progymnasmata* and other rhetorical literature could be attributed to his Greek education, possibly obtained at Samosata (46.19-20); it could also owe to his Constantinopolitan sojourn (74.24-28).⁴⁸ His composition of the *Life*, as demonstrated below, clearly reflects the impact of his rhetorical training, especially the epideictic or, more specifically, the encomiastic, that is, the third Aristotelian division of rhetoric and its later amplifications. The *Life*, however, does not seem to conform to any of the detailed outlines for encomium in the later *progymnasmata*, but is more in keeping with the broad guidelines for such composition. It seems to depend more on a tradition than on one of its late proponents. Moreover, Koriwn reveals familiarity with literary models in his details of the *Life*. Such literary works are noted in the discussion below.

This part of the study follows the recurrent pattern of encomium noted above: proem, origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue, and epilogue.

Proem

A sixth of the document is devoted to the proem (24.6-36.4), which is preceded by a brief statement on the intention to write the treatise: "I had been thinking of the God-given script . . . and through what kind of man that new divine gift had been revealed, as well as the luminous teaching and angelic, virtuous piety of that person, so as to cause memorials to blossom in an individual volume" (22.8-14). Koriwn declares himself unworthy of the task, calling himself "the least [of the pupils]" (22.18).⁴⁹ Such modesty is commonplace in classical literature, especially on the part of encomiasts of great men.⁵⁰

Equally typical is the beginning of the proem. The author wonders "whether it is allowed to declare in writing the lives of men of perfection" (24.6-7). He affirms that the challenge to praise such men derives from the Scriptures, where one finds a host of those named and unnamed "devout masters," both before and after Christ (30.1-9). Following a list of biblical examples of praise, he observes: "Hence it is evident . . . that praise of all the God-loving elect is from the Lord Himself, some from angels, and some from one to another, not for personal pride, but to stir up one another to be zealous, so that being mutually encouraged, we may succeed in the accomplishment of good works" (34.12-16). Like others before him, Koriwn is critical of the use of encomium for sheer ostentation;⁵¹ he opts for its pragmatic use (cf. 98.12 in the epilogue). He then alludes to the writings of the apostolic fathers, now deemed extracanonical: "We have also the gracious canonical writings which came after the apostles, indicating how they honored and praised one another in accordance with their true faith and evangelical piety" (34.19-21). He concludes: "And thus we have been allowed by them both [i.e., the canonical Scriptures and the extracanonical writings] to commit to writing the life of the just man" (lines 23-24).⁵²

The repeated use of the words *govut'iwn* (praise) and *govet* (to praise) in the proem is noteworthy. All seven occurrences of the verb are found only in the proem, as also six of the eight uses of the noun (the remaining two being praise given to God).⁵³ What Koriwn is about to render to the subject of his writing is—by implication—what the Scriptures and the extracanonical writings have rendered all along to the worthies of the past, namely, praise. These elements, together with Koriwn's intention to write (stated immediately before the proem) and his purpose for writing (stated at the end of the proem) are of considerable significance for the identification of the whole treatise as an encomium.⁵⁴

Origin and Family

Koriwn treats the encomiastic requirement of origin and family very briefly, by simply naming the birthplace, the province, and the father, "a blessed man" (36.5-7). Here he follows the instructions to omit discussing family should the person eulogized have no ancestral distinction.⁵⁵

Birth and Upbringing

The early life of Mashtots' is likewise covered briefly. Reference is made to his being tutored in Greek literature since childhood, his service in the royal secretariat, and his mastery of law and the military art. Koriwn hastens to add that with regard to the Scriptures, Mashtots' was self-taught while serving the princes (lines 8-17). Koriwn fulfills several conventional requirements in these few lines.

Accomplishments and Actions according to Virtue

The achievements of Mashtots' are treated chronologically and not topically under the virtues. The former is by far the preferred method in composing encomium. A summary of the actions of Mashtots' is given first, beginning with his abandoning the princely service and entering the service of Christ. All subsequent steps follow that initial move of joining a monastic order. A long list of endured hardships in the course of piety is given, and the summoning of pupils is seen as part of the same religious exercise. "And thus, bearing with a willful courage all the temptations that came upon him, and growing in radiance, he became known and pleasing to God and men" (38.2-17).

The master's toil on behalf of others is stressed (40.14; 48.6-7; 82.16-17). Toil and hardship in great accomplishments are among the essential elements in the composition of encomium.⁵⁶ Miracles or providential interventions accompanying these selfless efforts are noted (40.11-13; 42.8-10; 48.7-8; 92.17-20; 94.8-10). These also are among the expected features.⁵⁷ Somewhat related to the preceding, but perhaps more to the external advantages (e.g., having influential friends), is the parade of dignitaries who readily commit themselves or the services of their good offices to Mashtots': the Catholicos Sahak (passim), Shabit', Lord of Goght'an (40.2-6; 60.10-13), his son and successor, Kiwt (60.13-16), King Vramshapuh of Armenia (42.13-44.14; 46.7-8; 54.1-4, 9-10), Daniel, "a Syrian bishop of noble lineage" (42.15-17), Vaghenak, Lord of Siwnik' (60.18-22), his successor, Vasak (62.1-7), King Bakur of Georgia (62.14-19), the Emperor Theodosius (64.25-68.4), the Patriarch of Constantinople, Atticus (66.10-11), King Artashēs of Armenia (70.8-9), King Arsvagh of Albania (70.13-72.9), Khurs, Lord of Gardman

(72.18-24), King Ardziwgh of Georgia (72.25-28), and Ashushay, Lord of Dashir (72.29-74.2).

The four cardinal virtues are touched upon in passing, especially with reference to the Scriptural examples in the proem. With reference to Mashtots' and his work, all four are contemplated: justice (34.24), courage (38.15-16; 78.15-18; 90.10-11), wisdom (50.4-7; 54.14; 58.18), and temperance (passim, in the vigils of his devotional and monastic life). As a teacher, Mashtots' exemplified these virtues in his own life (58.15-16; 76.12-14; 80.11-12), "for all true teachers habitually set their virtues as rules for their pupils" (82.17-18). This Socratic ideal is widely held in Greek *paideia* and is a recurring feature in the encomiastic literature.⁵⁸ Understandably, in the *Life*, Christ is the teacher who set the ultimate example for his disciples, and they in turn passed it on to their followers. "Thus the blessed one [i.e., Mashtots'] had assumed this honored tradition, and similarly admonished all who came near him with the same exhortation" (86.3-4; cf. 84.3-5, 17-19; 86.1-2).

Comparison with renowned persons is yet another, often recommended step to extol great men and their meritorious achievements.⁵⁹ Such instances of encomiastic comparison are highlighted in the *Life*. The concern of Mashtots' for his people is no less than that of Paul for his people (40.18).⁶⁰ In describing the profound joy of Mashtots' on his return to Greater Armenia with the newly finalized alphabet, Koriwn declares: "Even the magnificent Moses was not as happy when he descended from Mount Sinai" because of the sinful people, "causing the bearer of His commandments to weep bitterly with a broken heart, as the bearer's sadness is readily perceived from his breaking the tablets" (52.1-8).⁶¹ Koriwn then adds this extended note:

Let no one consider us too bold for what we have said. We may be subject to censure for our analogy: equating a very modest man with the magnificent Moses, who had spoken with God and had done wonders. But we are all the more persuaded in the belief that there is no reason to disparage, overtly or covertly, that which is from God; for it is the grace of the one omnipotent God that is distributed to all earth-born nations [lines 13-19].

This is followed by comparing the ongoing scribal and evangelistic activity with that mandated by Moses in the Law, David in the Psalms, and Christ in the Gospel (54.18-56.9). Finally, the deeper sorrow of the ever-active Mashtots' over the death of his associate Sahak is compared with the sadness, loneliness, and relative inactivity of the Apostle Paul because of the temporary absence of his associate Timothy (90.2-11).⁶² Koriwn observes:

For if the holy Apostle upon not finding his co-worker, Timothy, says that his soul was restless, how much more intense is deemed the survivors' grief over those who are forever departed? Whereas the sadness caused by loneliness would not allow [someone like Paul]

to be cheerful, yet he [i.e., Mashtots'] continued with the grace of God, unerringly, the course of evangelism and administration of the Holy Church and strove even more [lines 5-10].

The two persons with whom Mashtots' is laudably compared are the first of the prophets and the last of the apostles: Moses and Paul, the two most famous biblical characters in the Old and New Testaments, respectively.

Beginning with the introductory comparison of the author's praise of Mashtots' and that of the biblical worthies, the masterful use of the Scriptures to draw contrast, to restate, and to reaffirm is noteworthy.

Epilogue

The last page of the treatise, following a detailed description of the Saint's death and burial, is a well-defined epilogue (96.18-100.5). The concerns indicated at the outset are restated in summary form. Koriwn has accomplished his task, which is in keeping with what the Scriptures and the extracanonical writings have for the worthies of the past, namely, praise. He goes on to suggest that his work is another, simpler "[Acts] of the Apostles" (98.6-7). He employs a literary commonplace by referring to the "much more" that could have been said about Mashtots' (lines 3-4),⁶³ whom he calls "my father" (lines 2-3), and concludes with restating the pragmatic aspect of encomium "as an inspiring example" for posterity (line 12; cf. 34.12-16 in the proem).⁶⁴ In the closing lines he gives necessary dates and "glory to Christ" (98.16-100.5).

The terminus ad quem for the composition of the *Life* seems to have been the solemn transfer of the body of Mashtots', three years after his death and burial, to its final resting place at the newly built church in Oshakan (94.11-18). This may be cited as further evidence for the *Life* as an encomium or "ceremonial oratory" written for that occasion.⁶⁵

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Koriwn's celebrated *Life of Mashtots'*, the best known of the earliest works composed in Armenian amidst the numerous translations of the Golden Age, is a disciple's tribute to his beloved master. Notwithstanding the overwhelming biographical and hagiographical elements in Koriwn's magnum opus, the present study shows that the work is composed as an encomium. The opening pages of the *Life* are crucial for identifying its literary genre within the rhetorical tradition. The repeated use of the words *govut'iwn* (praise) and *govet* (to praise) in the proem is indicative of the genre.

The common features of encomium, as found in encomiastic prose in classical literature, are readily recognizable in Koriwn's work. The author's thorough familiarity with this genre is discernible in much of the details within the broad, recurrent pattern of encomium: origin and family, birth and upbringing, accomplishments and actions according to virtue. As an encomiast, Koriwn shows awareness of theoretical manuals, literary models, as well as practical textbooks. The Aristotelian notion of comparison, among several other elements recurring in classical encomia, is a dominant feature in Koriwn. This is best seen in his drawing on biblical examples to exalt Mashtots'. Koriwn compares his praise of the blessed Saint with the Scriptures' praise of biblical worthies, suggesting that his writing is no less inspired than the Scriptures and that Mashtots' is no less a worthy than the prophets and the apostles. The bearer of the Armenian alphabet is likened to the Lawgiver of the Hebrews and the Apostle to the Gentiles. The high praise accorded to Mashtots' as a divine man bespeaks more of the *Life* as an encomium. Clearly, its author stands in the mainstream of a rhetorical and literary tradition.

The *Life* does not appear to have been structured according to a single pattern or one of the *progymnasmata*, and this is in keeping with the lack of structural uniformity discernible in existing encomia. There is, none the less, a general conformity with the basic rules for composing encomium, and encomiastic features abound in the details.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN

NOTES

1. See M. Abeghian's note on 78.3-5 in Koriwn, *Vark' Mashtots'i (Bnagirē dzeragrakan ayl' ēnt'erts'vatsnerov, t'argmanut'yamb, arajabanov ev tsanot'ut'yunnerov, i dzerñ Prof. Dr. M. Abeghiani)* (Koriwn, *Life of Mashtots'* [Text with Critical Apparatus, Translation, Introduction, and Notes by Prof. Dr. M. Abeghian]) (Erevan, 1941; reprinted in Classical Armenian Text Reprint Series; Delmar, N.Y., 1985), pp. 118-119. References to the text of Koriwn in this study are to the pages and lines of this edition.

2. For a select bibliography, see K.H. Maksoudian, "Introduction," in Koriwn, *Vark' Mashtots'i*, pp. xxix-xxxi.

3. The meaning of *krt/seragoyñ* (22.18) need not be limited to "youngest." For comparable commonplaces, see below, n. 50; see also N. Akinian, *S. Mashtots' Vardapet. Keank'n ew gortsunēut'iwnē handerdz kensagrut'eamb S. Sahakay* (Der Hl. Maschtotz Wardapet, sein Leben und sein Wirken nebst einer Biographie des Hl. Sahak, mit einer deutschen Zusammenfassung) (Vienna, 1949), p. 192. Koriwn apparently belonged to a later group of pupils; note the inclusive language in 58.2-16; cf. 74.24-28.

4. For the various editions of Koriwn, see the list in Maksoudian, pp. xxxi-xxxii, especially nos. 2 and 7 for the text of Pseudo-Koriwn.

5. N. Tsovakian [Bogharian], "P'ok'r Koriwni heghinaké" (The Author of the Shorter Koriwn), *Sion*, 33 (1959), 167-168, observes the redactor's dependence on the shorter, later version of the Armenian translation of Socrates Scholasticus' *Ecclesiastical History*, which could not have been translated before the end of the seventh century.

6. For a list of the manuscripts, see Maksoudian, p. xxxii.

7. See above, n. 1.

8. For examples, see M. Hadas and M. Smith, *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity*, Religious Perspectives, 13 (New York, N.Y., 1965); P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 5 (Berkeley, Calif., 1983). With reference to Koriwn's work, see M. Avdalbegian, *Hay gegharvestakan ardzaki skzbnavorumē—V dar* (The Origin of Armenian Artistic Prose—Fifth Century) (Erevan, 1971), pp. 128-141.

9. Norhad's rendering of *vark'* at 34.24 as "biography" could be misleading; see his translation of Koriwn, *The Life of Mashtots'* (New York, N.Y., 1964; reprinted in Koriwn, *Vark' Mashtots'i*, p. 26; "life" or "mode of living" would be a better translation, as of Gk. *bios* and Lat. *vita* (cf. 24.7).

10. "*Vark' Mashtots'i zhanrē ev patmagrakan nshanakut'yunē*" (Des particularités de genre et de la valeur historico-littéraire et historiographique de la "Vie de Machtotsz" de Koriwn), *Banber Matenadaran*, 7 (1964), 49-52.

11. Greek text in H. Rabe, ed., *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, *Rhetores Graeci*, 10 (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 1-51; Armenian text in *Srboy Hörn Meroy Movsēsi Khorenats'woy Matenagrut'iwkh'* (The Works of Our Holy Father Movsēs Khorenats'i), 2d ed. (Venice, 1865), pp. 341-581. See the recent discussion by G. S. Muradian, "'Pitoyits' girk'ē' ev nra hunaren nakhōrinakē" (The "Girk' Pitoyits'" and Its Greek Exemplar), *Patma-Banasirakan Handes*, 3 (1984), 111-124. On the date of Aphthonius, see J. R. Butts and R. F. Hock, "The Chreia Discussion of Aphthonius of Antioch: Introduction, Translation and Comments," in R. F. Hock and E. N. O'Neil, eds., *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, Volume I, *The Progymnasmata*, Texts and Translations, 27; *Graeco-Roman Religion*, 9 (Atlanta, Ga., 1986), p. 211.

12. Greek text in J. Felten, ed., *Nicolai Progymnasmata*, *Rhetores Graeci*, 11 (Leipzig, 1913).

13. Five *progymnasmata* survive under the names of Aelius Theon of Alexandria (2d cent. A.D.), Hermogenes of Tarsus (2d cent. A.D.), Libanius of Antioch (4th cent. A.D.), his pupil, Aphthonius of Antioch (late 4th cent. A.D.), and Nicolaus of Myra (5th cent. A.D.). The first and parts of the last two of these *progymnasmata* are among the Armenian translations by the so-called Hellenizing School of the late sixth century.

14. T. C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, 3 (1902), 89-261; O. Crusius, "Enkomion," in A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll, eds., *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 10 (Stuttgart, 1905), cols. 2581-2583; G. Fraustadt, *Encomiorum in litteris Graecis usque ad Romanam aetatem historia* (Leipzig, 1909); V. Buchheit, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon* (Munich, 1960); T. Payr, "Enkomion," in F. J. Dölger et al., eds., *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart, 1962), cols. 332-343; and J. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik* (Munich, 1974), pp. 177-210.

15. Of the works of Gorgias, the *Encomium of Helen* and *Defence of Palamedes* are extant; of Isocrates, *Helen*, *Busiris*, *Archidamus*, *Evagoras*, *Philippus*, and the *Panathenaicus* are noteworthy.

16. By Lucian: *Dionysus*, *De Calumniā*, *Dipsades*, *De Demo*, *Harmonides*, *Herodotus*, *Muscae Encomium*, and *Patria Encomium*. By Plutarch: *De Fortuna Romanorum*, *De Alexandrini Virtute*, *De Gloria Atheniensium*, and others.

17. See especially his *Pro Marcello*, *De Imperio Cn. Pompeii*, and the *Philippicae*.

18. Cf. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.1.14.
19. Cf. *ibid.* 3.4.9.
20. Chapter 3 (1425b34-1426b22), on embellishment; chapter 35 (1440b5-1441b29), on praise and blame.
21. H. Caplan, *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval Rhetoric* (Ithaca and London, 1970), p. 134.
22. 1366a23-1368a37.
23. Among Latin handbooks with traditional Greek elements, cf. Pseudo-Cicero (early 1st cent. BC.) *Ad Herennium* 3.6.10-8.15; Cicero (106-43 BC.) *De Oratore* 2.84.340-86.350; *Partitiones Oratoriae* 21.71-23.82; and Quintilian (ca. AD 30/35-100) *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.1-28 and 8.4.1-29.
24. For the surviving texts, see above, n. 13. The exercises covered (1) fable, (2) narrative, (3) moral anecdote, (4) maxim, (5) refutation and confirmation, (6) the commonplace, (7) encomium, (8) comparison, (9) character sketch, (10) description, (11) abstract question, and (12) introduction of a law. See D. A. Russell "Progymnasmata," in N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1970), p. 883.
25. *Rhetoric* 1358a36-1359a29, 1366a23-1368a37.
26. *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1436a32-1445b3.
27. See Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 1.2.2; Cicero *De Inventione* 1.9.12-10.13; *De Oratore* 1.31.141; *Partitiones Oratoriae* 20.69-70; Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.4.1-16, among others.
28. *Rhetoric* 1366a23-1368a37.
29. Cf. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.4.12.
30. *Rhetoric* 1366a23-1368a37. For a brief treatment of Aristotle's epideictic, see D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York, N.Y., and London, 1957), pp. 133-135.
31. *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1440b5-1441b29.
32. *Ibid.* 1440b5-13.
33. *Ibid.* 1440b14-23 (cf. 1422a7-11 and Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.10-8.15, where the three types of praise, built on external circumstances [*rerum externarum*], physical attributes [*rerum corporis*], and qualities of character [*rerum animi*], seem to be indebted to Anaximenes; the classification could be traced to Plato [*Philebus* 48E; *Phaedrus* 241C; *Euthydemus* 279A-D; *Gorgias* 447C; *Laws* 697B; *Epistles* 8.355B]).
34. *Ibid.* 1440b24-1441b13. Anaximenes goes on to provide brief instructions for the opposite, blame (1441b14-27).
35. Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.11-12.
36. *Ibid.* 3.7.13-8.15; cf. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.12.
37. Cicero *De Oratore* 2.85.345-347 (cf. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.15-16, where he values unique achievement, especially if done for the sake of others rather than for oneself; owing to Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1366b3-6, 1367a19).
38. *Ibid.* 2.85.348.
39. *Partitiones Oratoriae* 21.71-22.74 (cf. Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.8.15, where greater flexibility is allowed: "We need not use all three . . . because often not all of them apply, and often, too, when they do, the application is so slight that it is unnecessary to refer to them").
40. *Ibid.* 21.73 (cf. Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.4-6, where proof is required should the claims appear incredible to the hearer or reader).
41. *Ibid.* 22.75 (cf. Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.7.13 and Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.10, 15, where the chronological is preferred).
42. *Ibid.* 23.82.
43. Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.8.15.

44. D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor. Edited with Translation and Commentary* (Oxford, 1981), p. xxv.
45. Melik-Ohandjanian, pp. 49-52, quoting the Armenian text in part.
46. From R. Nadeau, "The Progymnasmata of Aphthonius in Translation," *Speech Monographs*, 19 (1952), 273; cf. Clark, p. 197, and Russell and Wilson, p. xxviii.
47. "Rhetoric, Greek," in Hammond and Scullard, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 921.
48. On rhetorical education in the Byzantine period, see G. L. Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," *Viator*, 1 (1970), 55-73, and H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 2 vols. (Munich, 1978), 1.92-120.
49. On the meanings of *krt/seragoyñ*, see above, n. 3.
50. Cf. Isocrates *Panegyricus* 13; *Panathenaicus* 36; Pseudo-Cicero *Ad Herennium* 3.6.11; Philo *De Vita Mosis* 2.1.
51. Cf. Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1367b36; Cicero *De Oratore* 2.84.341; Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.1.
52. Note that at the beginning of the proem Mashtots' is acclaimed as a perfect man and at the end as a just man.
53. See E. Demirchian, ed., *Haykakan Hamabarbar*, 2. Koriwn "Vark' Mashtots'i" (Armenian Concordance, 2: Koriwn, *Life of Mashtots'*) (Erevan, 1972; reprinted in Koriwn, *Vark' Mashtots'i*), pp. 55-56.
54. Contrary to Abeghian, who sees the proem as an apology for the ensuing historical account (pp. 13-16; cf. Maksoudian, pp. xiv-xv); and Akinian, who considers it a later addition by the author ("Patmut' iwn varuts' S. Mashtots' Vardapeti: K'nnut' iwn ew bnagir" [History of the Life of St. Mashtots' Vardapet: Research and Text] in *Mkhit'ar Tōnagirk'* [Vienna, 1949], p. 183).
55. Anaximenes *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1441a5-6; cf. Cicero *Partitiones Oratoriae* 22.74.
56. Cf. Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1366b3-6, 37-1367a5, 19; Cicero *De Oratore* 2.85.345-347; etc.
57. On portents, miracles, or divine acts, cf. Cicero *Partitiones Oratoriae* 21.73; Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.11.
58. Xenophon (*Memorabilia* 1.2.117) states that all teachers demonstrate to their disciples that they themselves practice what they teach—citing Socrates as an example. On the predominance of the Socratic example, see B. Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (Rome, 1986), passim.
59. Cf. Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1368a11-25: "Point out . . . that he has done it better than anyone else"; "The comparison should be with famous men who are themselves great" (lines 12,21; cf. Cicero *De Oratore* 2.85.348).
60. Alluding to Romans 9:1-3.
61. Alluding to Exodus 31:18-32:19.
62. Judging from the context, there seems to be a conflation, if not confusion, between Acts 17:14-16a (cf. 18:5) and 2 Cor. 2:13 (cf. 8.23). If the allusion is more to the latter passage, then the reference would be to Titus and not Timothy, and an early scribal error could be suspected here.
63. Cf. Ecclesiastes 12:9-12; John 20:30; 21:25; Philo *De Posteritate Caini* 144; *De Ebrietate* 32; *De Vita Mosis* 1.213. In a way, the reader is taken back to the personal inadequacy motif expressed by the encomiast at the beginning of the treatise (22.18).
64. See above, n. 51.
65. Cf. the verse encomium by Komitas Catholicos (ca. 560-628), *Sharakan Srbots' Hrip'simants'* (each of its thirty-six stanzas begins with each of the letters of the alphabet), composed on the occasion of the transfer of the relics of St. Rhipsimē to the church built for her near Echmiadzin early in the seventh century.